

This is a postprint version of the following published document:

Merino, M.; Ahedo, E. Plasma detachment in a propulsive magnetic nozzle via ion demagnetization, in: *Plasma sources science and technology*, 23 (032001), May 2014, pp. 1-5

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1088/0963-0252/23/3/032001>

© 2014 IOP Publishing Ltd.

# Plasma detachment in a propulsive magnetic nozzle via ion demagnetization

Mario Merino and Eduardo Ahedo

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

E-mail: [mario.merino@uc3m.es](mailto:mario.merino@uc3m.es)

**Abstract.** Plasma detachment in propulsive magnetic nozzles is shown to be a robust phenomenon caused by the inability of the internal electric fields to bend the supersonic ions along the magnetic streamtubes. As a result, most of the plasma momentum is effectively ejected to produce thrust, and only a marginal fraction of the beam mass flows back. Detachment takes place even if electrons are fully-magnetized and is intimately linked to the formation of local electric currents. The divergence angle of the 95%-mass flow tube is used as a quantitative detachment performance figure.

Magnetically-channeled plasmas are fundamental in many applications, ranging from material treatment to fusion and space propulsion. In particular, several plasma thruster concepts[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] employ, as their acceleration stage, a longitudinal magnetic field to create a divergent magnetic nozzle (MN), which transforms the internal energy of the plasma into axially-directed kinetic energy, thus producing a highly supersonic plasma beam[7]. While the purpose of a MN is the same as in a solid, de Laval nozzle[8], there are several differences in their operation: firstly, a MN has the key advantage of working in a contactless manner, thereby mitigating plasma losses and wall durability problems. Secondly, the expansion physics are more complex, far from one-dimensional[9], and depend strongly on the form in which internal plasma energy is stored, which is device-dependent[10, 11]. Lastly, there are significant differences in the processes of *thrust production* and *plasma detachment from the nozzle* due to the presence of the long-range electromagnetic forces.

The mission of any propulsive nozzle is to increment the delivered thrust. In a solid nozzle, the physical mechanism enabling this is the pressure exerted on the nozzle divergent walls. In a thruster with a wall-less MN, as we showed theoretically[9] and Takahashi *et al* later confirmed experimentally[12], thrust has two contributions: *pressure thrust* (only inside the plasma source) and *magnetic thrust* in the MN: the magnetized plasma develops diamagnetic electron azimuthal currents that oppose those running in the thruster coils, thus creating two repelling magnetic forces: one yields positive thrust on the thruster, while the second one accelerates the plasma outwards[13]. The MN can thus increase the total thrust of the initially-sonic plasma jet by roughly a factor of two[9], and an even larger factor if the plasma contains two disparate electron

populations[14, 15]. The actual thrust gain depends on the thermodynamic behavior of the plasma and the efficiency of the expansion (MN strength, divergence losses, etc).

There is ample consensus that the main uncertainty about the applicability of MNs in space propulsion is the ability of the plasma to detach efficiently from the closed magnetic lines[16]: once accelerated, it is imperative that the plasma beam releases itself from the magnetic field and continues to expand freely downstream. If this were not the case, the returning plasma would cancel the produced thrust and impinge on the spacecraft. Presently, experimental evidence of detachment is still incomplete, and its theoretical base is much debated. In one of the prevailing theories on the detachment of a globally current-free, divergent plasma jet, resistivity[17] or electron inertia[18] produce diffusive detachment of electron streamtubes from the magnetic field. In yet another scenario, the plasma-induced magnetic field stretches the MN to infinity, thereby circumventing the problem associated with closed-field lines[19].

We have recently shown that these mechanisms do not lead to *inward* detachment in a propulsive MN; quite on the contrary, electron diffusion detaches electron tubes *outward* from the magnetic lines, and the magnetic field induced by diamagnetic plasma currents opposes the applied one, thus increasing the divergence of the resulting MN instead of decreasing it[20]. This disagreement originates from two central limitations in previous models. Firstly, the detachment problem is studied independently and separately from the thrust production problem, in particular by neglecting the plasma thermal energy. However, a cold plasma behaves paramagnetically with respect to the applied field, instead of diamagnetically as expected in a hot plasma. This alters both the plasma acceleration and detachment processes. Secondly, they assume *local current ambipolarity* (LCA), that is  $\tilde{\mathbf{j}} = \mathbf{0}$  everywhere, (with  $\tilde{\mathbf{j}}$  the longitudinal electric current density of the plasma) forcing ion and electron streamtubes to coincide everywhere.

However, we have shown that LCA is doubly unsatisfactory. Mathematically, LCA is a vector condition supplanting the *scalar* one,  $\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{j}} = 0$ , thus leading to an incompatibility. Physically, it does not describe the actual (and useful) expansion regime in a propulsive MN, in which the light electrons are highly-magnetized and follow faithfully the magnetic tubes, but the heavy ions are essentially unmagnetized and governed by the ambipolar electric field of the plasma,  $-\nabla\phi$ . This means that, unless  $-\nabla\phi$  is *precisely* the value required by ions to expand along electron tubes, they will separate from magnetic tubes. Indeed, our previous studies on the near-region of the MN[9] showed the incipient inward separation of ions from electron/magnetic tubes, even in a fully quasineutral, initially zero-current plasma, leading naturally to  $\tilde{\mathbf{j}} \neq \mathbf{0}$  already before the MN turning point.

The purpose of this communication is to demonstrate the necessity of this separation and prove that it continues downstream and becomes a dominant feature of the 2D plasma expansion in the MN, enabling the detachment of the largest fraction of plasma into a free expanding plume. This phenomenon is shown to occur even for ion magnetizations greater than those expected in propulsive applications, supporting its generality. The ambipolar electric field is shown to be insufficient to sustain the LCA

condition. Finally, the conventional divergence angle of the 95%-mass flux plasma tube is used to quantify the detachment efficiency.

The discussion is based on the two-fluid, two-dimensional model of the supersonic plasma expansion in a divergent MN presented in [9], for which only a self-contained description of the assumptions and physics is given here. Let a plasma column of radius  $R$  be injected sonically at the throat ( $z = 0$ ) of a divergent magnetic field. The plasma is nearly collisionless (as required in an efficient MN), and globally current-free, ensuring that the thruster does not accumulate electric charge with time. As in the typical thruster operation regimes[3, 4, 5], it is assumed that electrons carry the internal energy of the plasma, and are fully magnetized, meaning that electron and magnetic streamtubes coincide everywhere. For the present purposes, electrons are considered isothermal and their inertia is neglected. Heavier, colder ions on the other hand can have any magnetization degree. The quasineutral ion and electron response is determined consistently without assuming LCA, by their corresponding continuity and momentum equations,

$$\nabla \cdot (n\mathbf{u}_i) = 0; \quad \nabla \cdot (n\mathbf{u}_e) = 0, \quad (1)$$


$$m_i (\mathbf{u}_i \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_i = -e\nabla\phi + e\mathbf{u}_i \times \mathbf{B}, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = -T_e \nabla \ln n + e\nabla\phi - eu_{\theta e} B \mathbf{1}_{\perp}, \quad (3)$$

where symbols are conventional and  $\mathbf{1}_{\perp} = \mathbf{1}_{\theta} \times \mathbf{B}/B$  is a unit vector perpendicular to the magnetic field. The resulting ion problem is accurately integrated with the method of characteristics. The prior limitation of the MN turning point in the simulations is overcome now by propagating the ion characteristic lines in local intrinsic coordinates (instead of  $z-r$ ) and renormalizing plasma density downstream.

Ion magnetization is characterized by the local ion gyrofrequency parameter,  $\hat{\Omega}_i(z, r) = eRB(z, r)/\sqrt{T_e m_i}$ . The magnetic field geometry  $\mathbf{B}(z, r)$  is defined by the coil layout, while the coil current controls the MN strength  $B_0$  and thus  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0}$ , with subindex 0 referring to the origin,  $(z, r) = (0, 0)$ . The simulations shown here use for illustration the MN of a single current loop of radius  $3.5R$  located at  $z = 0$ . To amply cover the foreseen application range [ $\hat{\Omega}_{i0} < \mathcal{O}(10)$  for the thrusters of [4, 21, 22, 5, 23]], two magnetic strengths  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0} = 1$  and 200 are used. Lastly, the initial plasma density and potential profiles are  $n(0, r) = n_0 J_0(a_0 r/R)$  and  $\phi(0, r) = 0$ , with  $J_0$  the Bessel function of the first kind and  $a_0$  its first zero (see Figure 2 in [9]); ions and electrons initially have axially the sonic velocity of ions,  $\sqrt{T_e/m_i}$ . Note that the model can be fully normalized with  $T_e$ ,  $m_i$ ,  $e$ ,  $R$  and  $n_0$ .

Plasma detachment due to ion separation in the far-region is illustrated in Figure 1, which shows the integrated ion (i.e. mass) flux from the axis (0%) to the plasma-vacuum boundary (100%) and the ion streamtubes containing 50% and 95% of the ion flux, for the two simulated cases. Except for the 100%-tube, where *global* current ambipolarity and quasineutrality ensure that ion and electron streamtubes coincide, ion tubes detach progressively from their initially-matching magnetic/electron tubes, becoming straight




**Figure 1.** Ion inward detachment for two magnetic strengths: (a)  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0} = 1$  and (b) 200. Thick solid white lines are streamtubes containing 50%, 95%, and 100% of the plasma mass flow. The thin solid red lines show the initially-corresponding magnetic streamtubes. 2D map shows the integrated mass flow (0% on the axis, 100% on the beam edge). Dashed red lines are  $B/B_0 = \text{const}$  lines. The red dot marks the MN ‘turning point’.


downstream and not flowing back; only a marginal fraction of the ion flow (less than 1%) is actually deflected backward. Indeed, this backflow fraction is not larger than the one found in ion or Hall thrusters. The ion detachment observed in the MN near region (say, for  $z/R < 15$ ) agrees with the existing vacuum-chamber measurements [21, 22, 24, 5, 23] (see e.g. Figure 4 of [21] and Figure 5 of [24]). Comparison of Figure 1(a) and Figure 1(b) shows that the same detachment mechanism operates at any  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0}$ , with only a minor increase of jet divergence at high  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0}$ .

A quantitative assessment of the detachment efficiency can be carried out using the effective divergence of the resulting plasma plume, which is conventionally defined as the angle  $\alpha_{div}$  formed between the 95%-mass flow streamtube and the plume centerline. Figure 2 plots the spatial evolution of  $\alpha_{div}$  for the two simulations and for the full ion-magnetization limit,  $\hat{\Omega}_i = \infty$ , in which ion detachment would be null everywhere. Clearly, the larger  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0}$  is, the farther out ion detachment starts to be apparent, and the larger the resulting plume divergence is. Interestingly,  $\alpha_{div}$  does not present an asymptote in the simulated region, and continues to increase with a decreasing rate. This behavior is related to the residual pressure in the plasma downstream, and is also observed in unmagnetized, isothermal plasma plumes [25]. Nevertheless, the most striking result is the modest difference between the ‘near unmagnetized’ case ( $\hat{\Omega}_{i0} = 1$ ) and the ‘high magnetization’ case ( $\hat{\Omega}_{i0} = 200$ ), which, in spite of the large  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0}$ , is still far from the  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0} = \infty$  case.

We now turn to analyze the physics behind the 2D detachment of the plasma jet. Firstly, for the *massless, confined* electrons, momentum equation (3) states that (i) on each magnetic/electron tube, the electric potential  $\phi(z, r)$  and plasma density  $n$  are related by a tube-dependent Boltzmann relation, and (ii) in the direction  $\mathbf{1}_\perp$  the expanding pressure force component  $f_p = -T_e \partial \ln n / \partial \mathbf{1}_\perp$  is balanced by the confining



**Figure 2.** Evolution, for different  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0}$ , of the divergence angle of the 95%-mass flow tube versus the radius of that tube. The dashed line corresponds to the total ion-magnetization limit,  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0} = \infty$ .



**Figure 3.** Maps for the  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0} = 1$  case of (a) perpendicular magnetic-to-pressure force ratio on electrons,  $f_m/f_p (= 1 - f_e/f_p)$ , and (b) normalized plasma density,  $n/n_0$ .

electric and magnetic forces,  $f_e = e\partial\phi/\partial\mathbf{1}_\perp$  and  $f_m = eu_{\theta e}B$ . Figure 3(a) quantifies the relative strength of these three force components. Observe that  $f_m \approx f_p \sim T_e/R \gg f_e$  near the throat, while downstream  $f_e$  gradually takes over the electron confinement task and  $f_m$  diminishes (except at the plasma-vacuum edge, where  $f_m$  remains large). In the bulk of the plasma,  $f_p$  decreases gradually downstream as can be inferred from the behavior of plasma density  $n$ , shown in Figure 3(b).

Secondly, for the ions, the shape of the streamtubes is dictated by the projection of Eq. (2) along  $\mathbf{1}_{\perp i}$ , i.e., the meridional unit vector perpendicular to ion velocity (note that  $\mathbf{1}_{\perp i} \neq \mathbf{1}_\perp$  in general),

$$m_i \kappa_i (u_{zi}^2 + u_{ri}^2) = -e\partial\phi/\partial\mathbf{1}_{\perp i} + \mathbf{1}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\perp i} eu_{\theta i} B + \mathbf{1}_r \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\perp i} m_i u_{\theta i}^2 / r, \quad (4)$$

where  $\kappa_i$  is the meridional curvature of ion streamtubes. From the conservation of ion canonical angular momentum, stated by the  $\theta$  component of Eq. (2),  $rm_i u_{\theta i} + e \int_0^r B_z r dr$  is a constant on each ion streamtube. Hence, for initially non-rotating ions,  $u_{\theta i} \leq \hat{\Omega}_{i0} \sqrt{T_e/m_i}$ . Thus, a rough, conservative estimate of  $\kappa_i$  in Eq. (4) with  $e\partial\phi/\partial\mathbf{1}_{\perp i} \sim$

$f_e \sim T_e/R$  shows that

$$\kappa_i R \sim (1 + \hat{\Omega}_{i0} \hat{\Omega}_i + \hat{\Omega}_{i0}^2 R/r)/M^2, \quad (5)$$

where  $M^2 = m_i(u_{zi}^2 + u_{ri}^2)/T_e$  is the (squared) ion Mach number. When ions are unmagnetized, as in the case of propulsive interest,  $\kappa_i$  is dominated by the electric force, while the magnetic and centrifugal terms are negligible, so  $\kappa_i R \sim 1/M^2$  vanishes as ions are accelerated. For  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0}$  large, a *paramagnetic* ion magnetic force develops, which tries to restore ion separation, with two negative effects: axial ion deceleration and increment of plume divergence. The crucial point is that (except in the  $\hat{\Omega}_{i0} \rightarrow \infty$  limit) only the electric force remains downstream once ions demagnetize, but it alone is insufficient to keep ion tubes matched with their corresponding electron/magnetic tubes as  $M$  increases, and eventually  $\kappa_i R \rightarrow 0$ , ensuring the escape of most of the ion flow from the MN as confirmed by the simulations of Figures 1–2. Therefore, inward ion separation (and the formation of longitudinal currents) is an unavoidable, beneficial detachment phenomenon in a propulsive MN.

Observe that ion separation does not necessarily imply the formation of non-neutral regions in the plume, nor the existence of a net electric current from the plasma source. However, the separation of ion and electron 2D tubes is intimately linked to the formation of local longitudinal electric currents  $\tilde{\mathbf{j}}$ . Had the LCA condition been imposed, ion separation would be impeded, and detachment consequently concealed. Moreover, while in our model Eq. (3) determines  $\phi$  and Eq. (4) determines  $\kappa_i$ , LCA forces  $\kappa_i \equiv \kappa_B$  (the magnetic curvature) and  $\phi$  is then determined again by Eq. (4), which is the incompatibility commented above (and clearly overestimates the electric field, in view of the actual ion streamlines).

It is important to notice that the existence of longitudinal currents does not affect the 2D ion response nor the MN operation (at least in the small plasma beta regime). Indeed, the parallel electron drift velocity  $u_{\parallel e}$  does not intervene in Eqs. (2)–(3). Therefore, the determination of  $\tilde{\mathbf{j}}$  is uncoupled from the rest of plasma problem[9] (and in particular, from the determination of  $\kappa_i$ ), which reflects the fact that electrons respond globally, not locally, to the expansion. Nevertheless, these currents must find a closure, both upstream (within the plasma source) and downstream. While the details of this closure are beyond the capabilities of the present model, we can still conjecture about the physical mechanisms that will allow it. Firstly, inside the plasma source, density and collisionality are large, allowing cross-field diffusion to close moderate electric currents. Secondly, in the large downstream region, currents will be canceled by the combination of multiple processes, such as geometrical decay of current densities and electron demagnetization. Note however that electron demagnetization will take place much further downstream than ions', given the large mass difference ( $m_i/m_e \sim 10^5$  for usual propellants).

Summarizing, the present analysis concludes that the separation of inertia-driven, unmagnetized ions due to the insufficiency of the ambipolar electric field in the far-region (well below the LCA value) constitutes a central physical mechanism enabling the inward detachment of the mass and momentum of a collisionless plasma jet in a

propulsive MN, even in the full electron magnetization limit.

Clearly, as advanced above, our present model does not include several effects that become important near the jet edge or far downstream. We comment very briefly on some of them. Firstly, relaxation of the full-electron-magnetization condition brings up resistivity and azimuthal electron inertia effects. Likewise, a lower applied magnetic field or a larger density increases the influence of plasma-induced magnetic field effects. All three phenomena cause outward electron detachment and increase jet divergence[13, 26]. The conflicting requirements of high magnetic field (to extend the region where these effects are negligible) and low ion magnetization (to foster their downstream detachment and achieve low beam divergence), indicates the existence of an optimal magnetic strength range, which depends on the  $m_i/m_e$  ratio.

Secondly, the assumption of electron isothermality in our model, while not central for the detachment process, leads to an unphysical logarithmic drop of the electric potential downstream. Limited laboratory and in-space evidence suggests that the electric potential vanishes proportionally to  $n^{\gamma-1}$  with  $\gamma \sim 1.1-1.2$  (as in a polytropic approximation). Kinetic approaches of related problems would suggest a *collisionless cooling* of the 2D expanding electrons based on adiabatic invariants and effective potential barriers[27, 28, 29]. Note nonetheless that the isothermal limit yields the worst-case scenario for detachment, since it overestimates the pressure (and thus the electric force) downstream.

Lastly, Figure 3(b) shows that beam rarefaction is large downstream and even larger sideways. Space-charge effects growing with decaying density will eventually invalidate quasineutrality and, since they set an upper-bound to the electric field, they could further limit ion tube divergence. Also, the presence of a tenuous background plasma (in chamber or in space) would smooth out the hard plasma-vacuum edge assumed here, and dominate the electric field as jet and background densities become comparable.

## Acknowledgments

This work has been sponsored by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, USAF (FA8655-12-1-2043) and Spain R & D National Plan (AYA-2010-61699).

## References

- [1] G. Krülle, M. Auweter-Kurtz, and A. Sasoh. Technology and application aspects of applied field magnetoplasma dynamic propulsion. *J. Propulsion and Power*, 14:754–763, 1998.
- [2] A.V. Arefiev and B.N. Breizman. Theoretical components of the VASIMR plasma propulsion concept. *Physics of Plasmas*, 11(5):2942–2949, 2004.
- [3] R. Winglee, T. Ziemba, L. Giersch, J. Prager, J. Carscadden, and B.R. Roberson. Simulation and laboratory validation of magnetic nozzle effects for the high power helicon thruster. *Physics of Plasmas*, 14:063501, 2007.
- [4] O.V. Batishchev. Minihelicon plasma thruster. *IEEE Transaction on Plasma Science*, 37:1563–1571, 2009.



- [5] K. Takahashi, Y. Itoh, and T. Fujiwara. Operation of a permanent-magnets-expanding plasma source connected to a large-volume diffusion chamber. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 44:015204, 2011.
- [6] E. Ahedo. Plasmas for space propulsion. *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion*, 53(12):124037, 2011.
- [7] S.A. Andersen, V.O. Jensen, P. Nielsen, and N. D’Angelo. Continuous supersonic plasma wind tunnel. *Phys. Fluids*, 12:557–560, 1969.
- [8] G.P. Sutton and O. Biblarz. *Rocket propulsion elements*. Wiley, 2010.
- [9] E. Ahedo and M. Merino. Two-dimensional supersonic plasma acceleration in a magnetic nozzle. *Physics of Plasmas*, 17:073501, 2010.
- [10] A. Sasoh. Simple formulation of magnetoplasmadynamic acceleration. *Physics of Plasmas*, 1:464–469, 1994.
- [11] M. Merino and E. Ahedo. Influence of electron and ion thermodynamics on the magnetic nozzle plasma expansion. In *33<sup>rd</sup> International Electric Propulsion Conference*, number IEPC-2013-247, Fairview Park, OH, 2013. Electric Rocket Propulsion Society.
- [12] K. Takahashi, T. Lafleur, C. Charles, P. Alexander, and R.W. Boswell. Electron diamagnetic effect on axial force in an expanding plasma: Experiments and theory. *Physical Review Letters*, 107(23):235001, 2011.
- [13] E. Ahedo and M. Merino. On plasma detachment in propulsive magnetic nozzles. *Physics of Plasmas*, 18:053504, 2011.
- [14] E. Ahedo and M. Martínez-Sánchez. Theory of a stationary current-free double layer in a collisionless plasma. *Physical Review Letters*, 103:135002, Sep 2009.
- [15] M. Merino and E. Ahedo. Two-dimensional quasi-double-layers in two-electron-temperature, current-free plasmas. *Physics of Plasmas*, 20:023502, 2013.
- [16] R.A. Gerwin, G.J. Marklin, A.G. Sgro, and A.H. Glasser. Characterization of plasma flow through magnetic nozzles. Technical Report AFSOR AL-TR-89-092, Los Alamos National Laboratory, 1990.
- [17] R.W. Moses, R.A. Gerwin, and K.F. Schoenberg. Resistive plasma detachment in nozzle based coaxial thrusters. In *Proceedings Ninth Symposium on Space Nuclear Power Systems, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1992*, AIP Conference Proceedings No. 246, pages 1293–1303, 1992.
- [18] E. B. Hooper. Plasma detachment from a magnetic nozzle. *Journal of Propulsion and Power*, 9(5):757–763, 1993.
- [19] A.V. Arefiev and B.N. Breizman. Magnetohydrodynamic scenario of plasma detachment in a magnetic nozzle. *Physics of Plasmas*, 12:043504, 2005.
- [20] M. Merino and E. Ahedo. Plasma detachment mechanisms in a magnetic nozzle. In *47<sup>th</sup> AIAA/ASME/SAE/ASEE Joint Propulsion Conference & Exhibit*, number AIAA-2011-5999, Washington DC, 2011. AIAA.
- [21] W. Cox, C. Charles, R.W. Boswell, and R. Hawkins. Spatial retarding field energy analyzer measurements downstream of a helicon double layer plasma. *Applied Physics Letters*, 93:071505, 2008.
- [22] C.A. Deline, R.D. Bengtson, B.N. Breizman, M.R. Tushentsov, J.E. Jones, D.G. Chavers, C.C. Dobson, and B.M. Schuettpelz. Plume detachment from a magnetic nozzle. *Physics of Plasmas*, 16:033502, 2009.
- [23] J.P. Squire *et al.* VASIMR VX-200 operation at 200 kW and plume measurements: Future plans and an ISS EP test platform. In *32<sup>nd</sup> International Electric Propulsion Conference*, 2011.
- [24] K. Terasaka, S. Yoshimura, K. Ogiwara, M. Aramaki, and M.Y. Tanaka. Experimental studies on ion acceleration and stream line detachment in a diverging magnetic field. *Physics of plasmas*, 17:072106, 2010.
- [25] M. Merino, E. Ahedo, C. Bombardelli, H. Urrutxua, and J. Peláez. Hypersonic plasma plume expansion in space. In *32<sup>nd</sup> International Electric Propulsion Conference*, number IEPC-2011-086, Fairview Park, OH, 2011. Electric Rocket Propulsion Society.

- [26] E. Ahedo and M. Merino. Two-dimensional plasma expansion in a magnetic nozzle: separation due to electron inertia. *Physics of Plasmas*, 19:083501, 2012.
- [27] M. Martínez-Sánchez and J. Navarro-Cavallé. private communication, 2013.
- [28] DS Dorozhkina and VE Semenov. Exact solution of vlasov equations for quasineutral expansion of plasma bunch into vacuum. *Physical review letters*, 81(13):2691–2694, 1998.
- [29] A.V. Arefiev and B.N. Breizman. Ambipolar acceleration of ions in a magnetic nozzle. *Physics of Plasmas*, 15:042109, 2008.